

Original citation:

Francis, Leslie J., Fawcett, B., Linkletter, J., Robbins, M. and Stairs, D.. (2016) Psychological type profile of Canadian Baptist youth leaders : implications for Christian education. International Journal of Christianity & Education.

Permanent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/80256>

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2056997116644264>

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP URL' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk

Psychological type profile of Canadian Baptist youth leaders:

Implications for Christian education

Leslie J Francis*

University of Warwick, UK

Bruce Fawcett

Crandall University, Canada

Jody Linkletter

Acadia Divinity College, Canada

Mandy Robbins

Glyndŵr University, UK

Dale Stairs

Acadia Divinity College, Canada

Author note:

*Corresponding author:

Leslie J Francis

Warwick Religions & Education Research Unit

Centre for Education Studies

The University of Warwick

Coventry CV4 7AL United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)24 7652 2539

Fax: +44 (0)24 7657 2638

Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

Abstract

A recent study of the psychological type profile of Christian youth workers in the UK drew attention to differences between the profiles of youth workers and clergy and highlighted distinctive strengths and weaknesses that may be experienced by youth workers in Christian ministry. The present study employing the Francis Psychological Type Scales among Canadian Baptist youth leaders (150 men, 186 women) cautions against generalising on the basis of findings from the UK study. Among the Canadian Baptist youth leaders, compared with the UK Christian youth workers, there were higher proportions of introverts, sensing types, thinking types and judging types.

Keywords: Psychology of ministry, youth leaders, Baptist, psychological type

Introduction

Recent special issues of *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion* (Village, 2011a) and *Mental Health, Religion and Culture* (Lewis, 2012) have highlighted the growing interest in and application of psychological type theory within the psychology of religion and within empirical theology. One particularly fruitful strand within this burgeoning field of research has focused on church leaders. This research has drawn attention to significant differences between the sexes (clergymen and clergywomen), between Churches (e.g. Anglicans and Methodists), between church orientations within the same Churches (e.g. Catholic and Evangelical Anglicans), and between forms of ministry (e.g. priests and bishops). Working within this tradition established within the psychology of religion and empirical theology, the present study is concerned with those who are appointed as Christian educators to specialist ministry among young people.

Psychological type theory

Psychological type theory has its roots in the pioneering work of Jung (1971) and has been developed and made more widely known through a series of type indicators, including the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985), the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (Keirsey & Bates, 1978), and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005). At its core psychological type theory identifies four key psychological characteristics and distinguishes between two expressions of each of these characteristics. The first characteristic is concerned with the source of psychological energy, and distinguishes between the two orientations of introversion and extraversion. The second characteristic is concerned with the way in which information is gathered, and distinguishes between the two perceiving functions of sensing and intuition. The third characteristic is concerned with the way in which information is evaluated, and the way in which decisions are made, and distinguishes between the two judging functions of thinking and feeling. The fourth characteristic is

concerned with the way in which the outside world is approached, and distinguishes between the two attitudes of judging and perceiving. A fuller description of these four characteristics is provided by Francis (2005) and by Hamill and Francis (2013).

Working within the context of practical theology, pastoral theology, and empirical theology, a series of studies published over the past twenty years has profiled the psychological type characteristics of men and women working in pastoral ministry within various churches in the United Kingdom, including clergy within the Church of Wales (Francis, Payne, & Jones, 2001; Francis, Littler, & Robbins, 2010), clergy within the Church of England (Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007; Francis, Robbins, Duncan, & Whinney, 2010; Village, 2011b; Francis, Robbins, & Whinney, 2011; Francis & Holmes, 2011; Francis, Robbins, & Jones, 2012; Francis & Village, 2012; Village, 2013), ministers within the Methodist Church (Burton, Francis, & Robbins, 2010), ministers within the Free Churches (Francis, Whinney, Burton, & Robbins, 2011), priests within the Roman Catholic Church (Craig, Duncan, & Francis, 2006), lead elders within the Newfrontiers network of churches (Francis, Gubb, & Robbins, 2009), and leaders within the Apostolic Networks (Kay, Francis, & Robbins, 2011).

Psychological type theory and youth ministry

Francis, Nash, Nash, and Craig (2007) set out to explore the psychological type characteristics of men and women who were undertaking professional training (either in the sense of initial training or ongoing professional development) for paid and voluntary youth ministry in the United Kingdom (mainly England) with churches and agencies, predominantly within an evangelical context. In the context of their professional training, Form G (Anglicised) of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCaulley, 1985) was completed by 155 male youth workers and by 134 female youth workers. According to these data, among male youth workers: 63% preferred extraversion and 37% preferred introversion;

51% preferred intuition and 49% preferred sensing; 55% preferred feeling and 45% preferred thinking; 53% preferred judging and 47% preferred perceiving. Among female youth workers: 59% preferred extraversion and 41% preferred introversion; 53% preferred intuition and 47% preferred sensing; 66% preferred feeling and 34% preferred thinking; 63% preferred judging and 37% preferred perceiving.

The psychological type profile of male Christian youth workers in the United Kingdom differed in two important ways from the psychological type profile more generally associated with men engaged in Christian ministry in the United Kingdom: there are higher proportions of extraverts and of perceivers engaged in youth ministry. For example, 63% of male Christian youth workers preferred extraversion, compared with 43% of Church of England clergymen (Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007), 41% of Church in Wales clergymen (Francis, Payne, & Jones, 2001), 40% of male Methodist ministers (Burton, Francis, & Robbins, 2010), and 38% of Roman Catholic priests (Craig, Duncan, & Francis, 2006). Similarly, 47% of male Christian youth workers preferred perceiving, compared with 34% of Roman Catholic priests (Craig, Duncan, & Francis, 2006), 32% of Church of England clergymen (Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007), 32% of Church in Wales clergymen (Francis, Payne, & Jones, 2001), and 30% of male Methodist ministers (Burton, Francis, & Robbins, 2010).

Although less pronounced, the differences between female Christian youth workers and clergywomen in the United Kingdom are in the same general direction as the differences between male Christian youth workers and clergymen: while 59% of female Christian youth workers preferred extraversion, the proportion fell to 46% among Church of England clergywomen (Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007). While 37% of female Christian youth workers preferred perceiving, the proportion fell only marginally to 34% among Church of England clergywomen (Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007).

Francis, Nash, Nash, and Craig (2007) reflected on the ways in which the distinctive psychological type profile of Christian youth workers in the UK may both shape positive aspects of their ministry among young people and at the same time lead to misunderstanding or conflict with parish and pastoral clergy. The higher proportion of extraverts among Christian youth workers suggest a body of ministers who may be especially comfortable in, adept at and energised by social engagement, group activities and being part of the crowd. Energised by social engagement, they may be able to invest considerable periods of time in such activities and enjoy the capacity to go on late into the evening (for the connection between extraversion and the diurnal rhythm see, for example, Francis, Fearn, & Booker, 2003). The higher proportion of perceiving types among Christian youth workers suggests a body of ministers who may be especially comfortable in and adept to responding to flexible and spontaneous environments, to unpredictable changes in plans and directions, and to shifting and developing trajectories of ministry. Energised by such flexibility and spontaneity, they may be able to engage creatively with the fluctuating moods and changing commitments of youth culture.

At the same time, these very same personality characteristics of those engaged in youth ministry may cause dissonance with the established expectations of parish clergy and pastoral ministers who, overall, tend to prefer the orientation of introversion and the attitude of judging. To the introverted types among parish clergy, youth ministers who prefer extraversion may appear *too* socially engaged and to lack the inner depth and quiet spirituality so preferred by introverts. For the judging types among parish clergy, youth ministers who prefer perceiving may appear *too* flexible and casual in addition to lacking the discipline and structured spirituality so preferred by judging types.

In a second study linking psychological type theory and youth ministry, Hamill and Francis (2013) reported on the psychological type profile of 66 male and 89 female volunteer

Christian youth leaders in Northern Ireland. They found no significant differences between the dichotomous preferences reported by their sample of male volunteer Christian youth leaders and Francis, Nash, Nash, and Craig's (2007) sample of male professional Christian youth workers. On the other hand, they found some significant differences between the dichotomous preferences reported by their sample of female volunteer Christian youth leaders and Francis, Nash, Nash, and Craig's (2007) sample of female professional Christian youth workers; among their sample there were fewer intuitive types and more sensing types, fewer perceiving types and more judging types. These findings suggest that it may be unwise to generalise too readily on the basis of the initial study reported by Francis, Nash, Nash, and Craig (2007).

Research question

Against this background, the aim of the present study is to test whether individuals responding to the call to serve as youth leaders within the Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches share the same psychological type characteristics as those displayed by professional Christian youth workers in the United Kingdom reported by Francis, Nash, Nash, and Craig (2007).

Youth ministry within the Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches

The Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches is an association of approximately 460 Baptist churches located in the four easternmost Canadian Provinces. Through the Convention member churches cooperate in mission, education, and service. One area of cooperation is in ministry to youth and families. The Convention states on its website (www.baptist-atlantic.ca) that the purpose of its Youth and Family Ministries department is to 'strengthen the churches of our Convention by assisting them to minister effectively to youth, young adults and families'. Furthermore, the website states that the Convention does this through planning and leading events for youth, equipping leaders, planning events and

initiatives for young adults, sponsoring educational and mission events for families, conducting research, and providing speakers for church services and cooperative events.

Youth leaders serving within churches of the Convention vary in their reflections on their call to serve in youth ministry. Those youth leaders who are ordained would often speak in terms of the role of scripture, the counsel of others, prayer, and experience in sensing a call to full-time vocational ministry. Volunteer youth leaders, on the other hand, may speak in terms of a lengthy reflection on the invitation to serve in leadership with youth or simply an agreement with their pastor following a brief conversation about serving as a local church youth leader. The notion of a call seems to vary widely among leaders (Fawcett, 2013).

Both volunteer and paid youth leaders participated in the survey. The amount of training received by the youth leaders varied widely. Some of the youth leaders would have earned a Master of Divinity degree and would be ordained to the Christian ministry. Other youth leaders would have a modest amount of training, and still other volunteer youth leaders would have little, if any, training before their church asked them to serve as a youth leader. The Convention provides both short evening youth ministry courses, a two year weekend training program for volunteer youth leaders, courses at the denomination's university (Crandall University) and seminary (Acadia Divinity College), and an internet based program called Horizons which was designed and developed by Dr Jeff Carter who serves in Europe with Canadian Baptist Ministries and the European Baptist Federation.

Data were collected either prior to group suppers or before an evening rally at the Tidal Impact mission and service event held every second summer in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, sponsored by the Convention. Tidal Impact is a weeklong event for young people between 12 and 18 years of age, which includes children's ministry, ministries of social concern, large worship gatherings, and fun events. Typically the event attracts nearly 1,000

youth and their leaders. The event is planned by staff of the Convention in partnership with local church leaders in the host areas.

Method

Procedure

The survey was conducted in the context of the week-long Tidal Impact youth mission and service events held in the summers of 2009 and 2011. The introduction to the survey included the following invitation,

Please say what you really think and try to be as honest and accurate as possible. There are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers to these questions. We are very interested in your views. Please do not discuss your answers with anyone else, and do not pause for too long over any one question.

Participation was voluntary, anonymous and confidential. In view of the intrinsic value and interest of the project, all invited participants agreed to complete the survey and almost all of the returned forms were thoroughly completed and valid.

Participants

A total of 336 Canadian Baptist youth leaders submitted thoroughly completed and valid questionnaires, 150 men and 186 women. In terms of age profile, 28 were under the age of twenty, 149 were in their twenties, 64 in their thirties, 60 in their forties, 28 in their fifties, and 7 in their sixties. In terms of status, 214 were unpaid, 38 were paid part-time, 83 were paid full-time, and one did not disclose this information.

There is no national Baptist youth office within Canadian Baptist Ministries that can serve as a consulting and gathering body designed to pull together youth leaders from the four regional denominational bodies to plan cooperative training events for leaders. However, Bruce Fawcett, who served as Director of Youth and Family Ministries for the largest of the regional bodies, the Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches, and who served as Chair of the Canadian Baptist Youth executive, estimates, based on eight years of experience in those

roles, that nearly half of the paid Canadian Baptist youth pastors were in attendance at Tidal Impact and approximately one third of the volunteer youth leaders were present.

Instrument

Psychological type was assessed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS: Francis, 2005). This is a 40-item instrument comprising four sets of 10 forced-choice items related to each of the four components of psychological type: orientation (extraversion or introversion), perceiving process (sensing or intuition), judging process (thinking or feeling), and attitude toward the outer world (judging or perceiving). Recent studies have demonstrated that this instrument functions well in church-related contexts as indicated, for example, by the alpha coefficient of internal consistency reliability proposed by Cronbach (1951) well in excess of the threshold of acceptability of .65 proposed by DeVellis (2003): Francis, Craig, and Hall (2008) reported alpha coefficients of .83 for the EI scale, .76 for the SN scale, .73 for the TF scale, and .79 for the JP scale. Participants were asked for each pair of characteristics to check the 'box next to that characteristic which is closer to the real you, even if you feel both characteristics apply to you. Tick the characteristics that reflect the real you, even if other people see you differently'.

Data analysis

The research literature concerning the empirical investigation of psychological type has developed a highly distinctive method for analyzing, handling, and displaying statistical data in the form of 'type tables'. This convention has been adopted in the following presentation in order to integrate these new data within the established literature and to provide all the detail necessary for secondary analysis and further interpretation within the rich theoretical framework afforded by psychological type. Type tables have been designed to provide information about the sixteen discrete psychological types, about the four dichotomous preferences, about the six sets of pairs and temperaments, about the dominant

types, and about the introverted and extraverted Jungian types. Commentary on this table will, however, be restricted to those aspects of the data strictly relevant to the research question.

Results

The indices of the Francis Psychological Type Scales achieved satisfactory levels of internal consistency reliability among the sample of 155 volunteer Christian youth leaders, achieving alpha coefficients generally in excess of the threshold of .65 proposed by DeVellis (2003): extraversion and introversion, $\alpha = .80$; sensing and intuition, $\alpha = .63$; thinking and feeling, $\alpha = .67$; judging and perceiving, $\alpha = .78$.

Table 1 presents the psychological type distribution for the 150 male Canadian Baptist youth leaders. These data demonstrate a balance between extraversion (50%) and introversion (50%), and preference for sensing (61%) over intuition (39%), for thinking (57%) over feeling (43%), and for judging (73%) over perceiving (27%). The hierarchy of dominant preferences are dominant sensing (37%), dominant thinking (23%), dominant feeling (21%), and dominant intuition (20%). In terms of the 16 complete types, the four predominant types are ISTJ (19%), ISFJ (12%), ESTJ (10%), and ESFJ (10%).

- insert Tables 1 and 2 about here -

Table 2 presents the psychological type distribution for the 186 female Canadian Baptist youth leaders. These data demonstrate preferences for extraversion (54%) over introversion (46%), for sensing (71%) over intuition (29%), for feeling (60%) over thinking (40%), and for judging (86%) over perceiving (15%). The hierarchy of dominant preferences are dominant sensing (38%), dominant feeling (31%), dominant thinking (19%) and dominant intuition (13%). In terms of the 16 complete types, the four predominant types are ESFJ (18%), ISTJ (17%), ISFJ (17%), and ESTJ (12%).

Discussion

In their study of a sample of 155 male and 134 female professional Christian youth workers in England, Francis, Nash, Nash, and Craig (2007) drew attention to the distinctive psychological type profile of men and women engaged in this form of ministry that set them apart from the psychological type profile of clergy. The two major differences between the individuals engaged in these two forms of ministry resided in the orientations and in the attitudes. Professional Christian youth workers were significantly more likely than the clergy to prefer extraversion and to prefer perceiving. The purpose of the present study was to test whether individuals responding to the call to serve as youth leaders within the Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches shared the same psychological type characteristics as those displayed by professional Christian youth workers in the United Kingdom. The new data generated by this study confirms the importance of not generalising research findings from one church context to another. The psychological profile of Christian youth leaders is not the same in the Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches as within Evangelical Churches in England. Moreover, these differences are not confined to the orientations and to the attitudes that were the primary concern of the present study, but extend to the perceiving functions and to the judging functions as well.

The differences in the psychological type profiles of the male youth leaders in Evangelical Churches in England and in the Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches can be summarised as follows. In terms of the orientations, the Canadian leaders contain a higher proportion of introverts (50% compared with 37%). In terms of the perceiving functions, the Canadian leaders contain a higher proportion of sensing types (61% compared with 49%). In terms of the judging functions, the Canadian leaders contain a higher proportion of thinking types (57% compared with 45%). In terms of the attitudes, the Canadian leaders contain a higher proportion of judging types (73% compared with 53%).

The differences in the psychological type profiles of the female youth leaders in Evangelical Churches in England and in the Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches can be summarised as follows. In terms of the orientations, the Canadian leaders contain a slightly higher proportion of introverts (46% compared with 41%). In terms of the perceiving functions, the Canadian leaders contain a higher proportion of sensing types (71% compared with 47%). In terms of judging functions, the Canadian leaders contain a slightly higher proportion of thinking types (40% compared with 34%). In terms of the attitudes, the Canadian leaders contain a higher proportion of judging types (86% compared with 63%).

Conclusion

Two main conclusions emerge from the data discussed above. The first conclusion concerns the potential implications of these differences in psychological type profile for the ways in which Christian education and youth ministry may be conceptualized and delivered within different groups of Churches on different sides of the Atlantic. Since the present study draws on data from Canada these differences will be discussed from the Canadian perspective. The four differences of emphasis from the Canadian perspective are weighted in favour of introversion, sensing, thinking, and judging. The potential implications of these four differences will be discussed in turn.

Youth ministers who exhibit characteristics of introversion may place less emphasis on social activities and social engagement, less emphasis on group activities and interpersonal interaction. Youth ministers who exhibit characteristics of introversion may place more emphasis within Christian education on the interior journey, on personal and individual engagement with the spiritual tradition, and on opportunities for quiet time and for devotional engagement. In practical terms this may mean that less time is spent in developing the outward-facing social interactions of the Christian faith and more time in developing the inward-facing personal spiritual journey.

Youth ministers who exhibit characteristics of sensing may place less emphasis within Christian education on experimental worship, on novel ways of explaining and expressing the faith, and on changing structures and practices. Youth ministers who exhibit characteristics of sensing may place more emphasis on encountering, grasping and respecting the inherited traditions of the church, in studying scripture and taking scripture seriously, and on respecting and conserving conservative doctrine, teaching and practice. In practical terms this may mean that less time is spent in exploring new ways of expressing and celebrating the Christian faith and more time in consolidating and deepening familiarity with the denominational heritage.

Youth ministers who exhibit characteristics of thinking may place less emphasis within Christian education on interpersonal values, on maintaining good relationships and harmony at all costs, and a shying away from confrontation on difficult issues. Youth ministers who exhibit characteristics of thinking may place more emphasis on religion of the head rather than religion of the heart, on responding to the God of justice rather than to the God of mercy, on standing up for the gospel of truth and justice rather than the gospel of peace and harmony, and on calling others to account in the best interests of the call to faithful discipleship. In practical terms this may mean that less time is spent in exploring paths of reconciliation and more time in challenging repentance.

Youth ministers who exhibit characteristics of judging may place less emphasis within Christian education on a ministry that is flexible and responsive, on sitting light to structures and on going with the flow of youth culture and the shifting agenda of young people themselves. Youth ministers who exhibit characteristics of judging may place more emphasis on structure, on discipline, on visible commitment and regular attendance, and on long term planning with strategic objectives and assessable outcome. In practical terms this

may mean that less time is spent in listening to the changing patterns of youth culture and more time in communicating the expectations of the Church.

These implications for the preferred type-related emphases of youth ministers are based on extrapolations from psychological type theory and need now properly to become the basis of further empirical investigation. A similar extrapolation was conducted by Francis and Payne (2002) in respect of parochial ministry and tested empirically in the development of the Payne Index of Ministry Styles (PIMS). Their empirical data supported the validity of this approach.

The second conclusion concerns the broader theological reflection on the empirically observed connection between, on the one hand, different forms of Christian ministry (e.g. youth ministry and parish-based parochial ministry) and different cultural and denominational contexts (e.g. Evangelical Churches in England and Convention of Atlantic Baptist Churches) and, on the other hand differences in the psychological type profile of those called to authorised ministries within those Churches. While psychological type theory is rooted in psychological science and the psychology of individual differences, it has been adapted more recently within a Christian anthropology in the context of the notion of a theology of individual difference. The theology of individual difference is rooted by Francis and Village (2008) within the framework of systematic theology that distinguishes between those aspects of individual differences that can be legitimately located within the doctrine of creation (reflecting the divine image of the creator) and those aspects of individual differences that can be legitimately located within the doctrine of the fall (and consequently are subject to the saving grace of Christ). Drawing on Genesis 1: 27 they locate psychological type differences, alongside sex differences and ethnic differences, as properly reflecting the diversity within the divine image.

Working from this starting point, rooted in a strong doctrine of creation, there is no *prima facie* reason to argue that either introverts or extraverts reflect less of the image of God in whom they are created; and the same case applies equally to sensing types and intuitive types, to feeling types and thinking types, to judging types and perceiving types. There is no *prima facie* reason drawing on the doctrine of the fall, to argue that either introverts or extraverts, either sensing types or intuitive types, either feeling types or thinking types, either judging types or perceiving types reflect greater corruption of the divine image. Moreover, drawing on the doctrine of salvation, there is no *prima facie* case to argue that God is more likely to love or more likely to call either extraverts or introverts, either sensing types or intuitive types, either feeling types or thinking types, either judging types or perceiving types.

Given the recognition and acceptance of this starting point, the way in which different church traditions seem to call and to empower different psychological types of people may start a new train of thought about the way in which God uses the diversity of church traditions to reach all people. Such a view has powerful implications both for ways in which church history is read and interpreted and for ways in which the contemporary ecumenical movement is read and interpreted. Perhaps the denominational scene is neither divisive nor competitive, but complementary and strategic, in order both to protect the Johannine vision of unity among God's people and to value the empirical reality of diversity in church traditions, Francis and Richter (2007) introduced and began to test the model of 'multiplex church' building on the experience of the multiplex cinema in which the one cinema both allowed for and provided diversity in cinematic experiences. Perhaps in a similar way within the transcendent multiplex church God rejoices to allow diversity to flourish. If this were so, it is right to expect different church traditions to build Christian education through youth ministries in different ways, and to do so by drawing together distinctive balances of psychological type among youth leaders. However, it might be equally right for churches to

encourage a pool of called, trained, and authorised youth leaders to experience the exercise of their ministry across denominational divides. It might even be right for some of these youth leaders to come to the recognition that their gifts might be better developed in the service of God within church traditions different from that within which they first recognised their call to ministry.

Finally, the present study has added one more distinctive group to the steadily growing literature on the psychological type profiles of the variety of groups of men and women engaged in various forms of Christian ministry. This growing literature offers psychological, theological and practical insights into all the challenges and opportunities facing Christian ministry today. The literature remains, however, far from complete and open to enrichment from further studies in the field.

References

- Burton, L., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2010). Psychological type profile of Methodist circuit minister in Britain: Similarities with and differences from Anglican clergy. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 23, 64-81.
- Craig, C. L., Duncan, B., & Francis, L. J., (2006). Safeguarding tradition: Psychological type preferences of male vergers in the Church of England. *Pastoral Psychology*, 54, 457-463.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16, 297-334.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. London: Sage.
- Fawcett, B. G. (2013). *Why do young people decide to become Christian ministers?* Lewiston: New York: Mellen.
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., & Hall, G. (2008). Psychological type and attitude toward Celtic Christianity among committed churchgoers in the United Kingdom: An empirical study. *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, 23, 181-191.
- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Whinney, M., Tilley, D., & Slater, P. (2007). Psychological profiling of Anglican clergy in England: Employing Jungian typology to interpret diversity, strengths, and potential weaknesses in ministry. *International Journal of Practical Theology*, 11, 266-284.
- Francis, L. J., Fearn, M., & Booker, B. B. (2003). Artistic creativity: Personality and the diurnal rhythm. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 5, 147-152.

- Francis, L. J., Gubb, S., & Robbins, M. (2009). Psychological type profile of Lead Elders within the Newfrontiers network of churches in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Belief and Values*, 30, 61-69.
- Francis, L. J., & Holmes, P. (2011). Ordained Local Ministers: The same Anglican orders, but of different psychological temperaments? *Rural Theology*, 9, 151-160.
- Francis, L. J., Littler, K., & Robbins, M. (2010). Psychological type and Offa's Dyke: Exploring differences in the psychological type profile of Anglican clergy serving in England and Wales. *Contemporary Wales*, 23, 240-251.
- Francis, L. J., Nash, P., Nash, S., & Craig, C. L. (2007). Psychology and youth ministry: Psychological type preferences of Christian youth workers in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Youth Ministry*, 5, 73-90.
- Francis, L. J. & Payne, V. J. (2002). The Payne Index of Ministry Styles (PIMS): Ministry styles and psychological type among male Anglican clergy in Wales. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 13, 125-141.
- Francis, L. J., Payne, V. J., & Jones, S. H. (2001). Psychological types of male Anglican clergy in Wales. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 56, 19-23.
- Francis, L. J. & Richter, P. (2007). *Gone for Good? Church-leaving and returning in the 21st century*. Peterborough: Epworth,
- Francis, L.J. Robbins, M., Duncan, B., & Whinney, M. (2010). Confirming the psychological type profile of Anglican clergymen in England: A ministry for intuitives. In B. Ruelas and V. Briseno (Eds.), *Psychology of intuition* (pp. 211-219). New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Jones, S. H. (2012). The psychological type profile of clergywomen in ordained local ministry in the Church of England: Pioneers or custodians? *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 15, 945-953.

- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Whinney, M. (2011). Women priests in the Church of England: Psychological type profile. *Religions, 2*, 389-397.
- Francis, L. J., & Village, A. (2012). The psychological temperament of Anglican clergy in ordained local ministry (OLM): The conserving, serving pastor? *Journal of Empirical Theology, 25*, 57-76.
- Francis, L. J., Whinney, M., Burton, L., & Robbins, M. (2011). Psychological type preferences of male and female Free Church Ministers in England. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, 22*, 251-263.
- Hamill, P., & Francis, L. J. (2013). The psychological type profile of volunteer Christian youth leaders: An empirical study conducted in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Youth Ministry, 11*(2), 73-86.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works*, (volume 6). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kay W. K., Francis, L.J., & Robbins M. (2011). A distinctive leadership for a distinctive network of churches? Psychological type theory and the Apostolic Networks. *Journal of Pentecostal Theology, 20*, 306-322.
- Keirse, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis.
- Lewis, C. A. (2012). Psychological type, religion, and culture: Theoretical and empirical perspectives. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture, 15*, 817-821.
- McCaulley, M. H. (1985). The Selection Ratio Type Table: A research strategy for comparing type distributions. *Journal of Psychological Type, 10*, 46-56.
- Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Village, A. (2011a). Introduction to special section: Psychological type and Christian ministry. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion, 22*, 157-164.

Village, A., (2011b). Gifts differing? Psychological type among stipendiary and non-stipendiary clergy. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 22, 230-250.

Village, A. (2013). Traditions within the Church of England and psychological type: A study among the clergy. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 26, 22-44.

Table 1

Type distribution for male Canadian Baptist youth leaders

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences		
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 29 (19.3%) +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 18 (12.0%) +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 4 (2.7%) +++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 9 (6.0%) +++++	E	<i>n</i> = 75	(50.0%)
				I	<i>n</i> = 75	(50.0%)
				S	<i>n</i> = 91	(60.7%)
				N	<i>n</i> = 59	(39.3%)
				T	<i>n</i> = 86	(57.3%)
				F	<i>n</i> = 64	(42.7%)
				J	<i>n</i> = 110	(73.3%)
				P	<i>n</i> = 40	(26.7%)
				Pairs and Temperaments		
ISTP <i>n</i> = 4 (2.7%) +++	ISFP <i>n</i> = 2 (1.3%) +	INFP <i>n</i> = 3 (2.0%) ++	INTP <i>n</i> = 6 (4.0%) ++++	IJ	<i>n</i> = 60	(40.0%)
				IP	<i>n</i> = 15	(10.0%)
				EP	<i>n</i> = 25	(16.7%)
				EJ	<i>n</i> = 50	(33.3%)
				ST	<i>n</i> = 51	(34.0%)
				SF	<i>n</i> = 40	(26.7%)
				NF	<i>n</i> = 24	(16.0%)
				NT	<i>n</i> = 35	(23.3%)
ESTP <i>n</i> = 3 (2.0%) ++	ESFP <i>n</i> = 5 (3.3%) +++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 6 (4.0%) ++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 11 (7.3%) +++++	SJ	<i>n</i> = 77	(51.3%)
				SP	<i>n</i> = 14	(9.3%)
				NP	<i>n</i> = 26	(17.3%)
				NJ	<i>n</i> = 33	(22.0%)
				TJ	<i>n</i> = 62	(41.3%)
				TP	<i>n</i> = 24	(16.0%)
				FP	<i>n</i> = 16	(10.7%)
				FJ	<i>n</i> = 48	(32.0%)
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 15 (10.0%) +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 15 (10.0%) +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 11 (7.3%) +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 9 (6.0%) +++++	IN	<i>n</i> = 22	(14.7%)
				EN	<i>n</i> = 37	(24.7%)
				IS	<i>n</i> = 53	(35.3%)
				ES	<i>n</i> = 38	(25.3%)
				ET	<i>n</i> = 38	(25.3%)
				EF	<i>n</i> = 37	(24.7%)
				IF	<i>n</i> = 27	(18.0%)
				IT	<i>n</i> = 48	(32.0%)

Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types		
	<i>n</i>	%		<i>N</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%
E-TJ	24	16.0	I-TP	10	6.7	Dt.T	34	22.7
E-FJ	26	17.3	I-FP	5	3.3	Dt.F	31	20.7
ES-P	8	5.3	IS-J	47	31.3	Dt.S	55	36.7
EN-P	17	11.3	IN-J	13	8.7	Dt.N	30	20.0

Note: N = 150 (NB: + = 1% of N)

Table 2

Type distribution for female Canadian Baptist youth leaders

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences			
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 31 (16.7%) +++++ +++++ +++++ ++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 31 (16.7%) +++++ +++++ +++++ ++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 11 (5.9%) +++++ +	INTJ <i>n</i> = 3 (1.6%) ++	E I S N T F J P	<i>n</i> = 101 <i>n</i> = 85 <i>n</i> = 132 <i>n</i> = 54 <i>n</i> = 74 <i>n</i> = 112 <i>n</i> = 159 <i>n</i> = 27	(54.3%) (45.7%) (71.0%) (29.0%) (39.8%) (60.2%) (85.5%) (14.5%)	
ISTP <i>n</i> = 2 (1.1%) +	ISFP <i>n</i> = 4 (2.2%) ++	INFP <i>n</i> = 2 (1.1%) +	INTP <i>n</i> = 1 (0.5%) +	Pairs and Temperaments			
				IJ IP EP EJ	<i>n</i> = 76 <i>n</i> = 9 <i>n</i> = 18 <i>n</i> = 83	(40.9%) (4.8%) (9.7%) (44.6%)	
				ST SF NF NT	<i>n</i> = 60 <i>n</i> = 72 <i>n</i> = 40 <i>n</i> = 14	(32.3%) (38.7%) (21.5%) (7.5%)	
ESTP <i>n</i> = 4 (2.2%) ++	ESFP <i>n</i> = 4 (2.2%) ++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 9 (4.8%) +++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 1 (0.5%) +	SJ SP NP NJ	<i>n</i> = 118 <i>n</i> = 14 <i>n</i> = 13 <i>n</i> = 41	(63.4%) (7.5%) (7.0%) (22.0%)	
				TJ TP FP FJ	<i>n</i> = 66 <i>n</i> = 8 <i>n</i> = 19 <i>n</i> = 93	(35.5%) (4.3%) (10.2%) (50.0%)	
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 23 (12.4%) +++++ +++++ ++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 33 (17.7%) +++++ +++++ +++++ +++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 18 (9.7%) +++++ +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 9 (4.8%) +++++	IN EN IS ES	<i>n</i> = 17 <i>n</i> = 37 <i>n</i> = 68 <i>n</i> = 64	(9.1%) (19.9%) (36.6%) (34.4%)	
				ET EF IF IT	<i>n</i> = 37 <i>n</i> = 64 <i>n</i> = 48 <i>n</i> = 37	(19.9%) (34.4%) (25.8%) (19.9%)	
Jungian Types (E)			Jungian Types (I)			Dominant Types	
	<i>n</i>	%		<i>N</i>	%		
E-TJ	32	17.2	I-TP	3	1.6	Dt.T	35 18.8
E-FJ	51	27.4	I-FP	6	3.2	Dt.F	57 30.6
ES-P	8	4.3	IS-J	62	33.3	Dt.S	70 37.6
EN-P	10	5.4	IN-J	14	7.5	Dt.N	24 12.9

Note: N = 186 (NB: + = 1% of N)